DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 865 TE 001 350

By-Miles, Leland

Where Do You Stand on Linguistics? CEA Chap Book.

College English Association, Inc.

Pub Date 64

Note-32p.; Supplement to The CEA Critic, v26, n4 January 1964.

Available from-Donald A. Sears, Department of English, California State College, Fullerton, Calif. 92631 (HC $0.75), and NCTE, 508 S. 6th St., Champaign, Ill. 61820 (Stock No. 27900, HC $0.50).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-•Applied Linguistics, Diachronic Linguistics, English, Language Instruction, Language Tests, •Linguistics, Linguistic Theory, Self Evaluation, •Teacher Attitudes, •Teacher Evaluation, •Tests

This test was constructed to determine individual reaction to various linguistic principles and implications. The test consists of 170 "agree-disagree" items: 106 statements of principle (e.g., "The function of a dictionary is not to prescribe rules on how a language should operate, but simply to record what people say and write") and 64 practical implications (e.g., "The classroom study of literature should focus primarily on techniques rather than content"). Three major purposes shoulc focus primarily on techniques rather than content"). Three major purposes implicit in the test construction are (1) to clarify in layman's terms the major linguistic ideas; (2) to help the individual instructor determine his own attitudes toward linguistics and its classroom applications; and (3) to simulate constructive discussion about linguistics. Interpretations of various scores are given, and a selected bibliography on linguistics is appended. (LH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED029865

CEA Chap Book

WHERE DO YOU STAND ON LINGUISTICS?

by

LELAND MILES

TE 001 350

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY C.E.A. and author
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright © 1964 by the College English Association, Inc.
Revised February, 1968.

All rights reserved. No part of this Chap Book may be reproduced without permission of the Editor, Department of English, California State College at Fullerton, Calif. 92631

Distributed as a Supplement to THE CEA CRITIC, XXVI, No. 4, January 1964. Additional copies available from the editor at 75c a copy. 5 or more copies, 60c each. Donald A. Sears, Editor.

EDITORIAL NOTE

Leland Miles is President of Alfred University, after having served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Bridgeport. An English scholar and teacher, as well as administrator, he has held an American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship at Harvard, and during 1964 served as a Fulbright research scholar at King's College, University of London. A specialist in early Renaissance literature, he is not a professional linguist but a scholar-teacher who, in his own words, "became ashamed of my linguistic ignorance and decided to do something about it." The result was this paper, originally written for no more ambitious purpose than to clarify his own thinking.

At a time when most English departments are arguing over the possible role of linguistics in the total educational process and particularly in Freshman English, The College English Association believes that this paper—with its self-grading test—can serve a constructive purpose in dispelling some of the fog that has drifted over the linguistic scene.

DONALD A. SEARS
Executive Director
The College English Association

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank those of my University of Cincinnati colleagues, especially Professors William Boyce and Leonard Nathanson, whose detailed comments resulted in the improvement of this paper. On the same score I am also indebted to Professor Donald R. Benson and his editorial associates on the *Iowa English Yearbook* (Iowa State University); to Mr. Larry Pathe, technical editor of the Flight Propulsion Division of General Electric; and to Donald J. Lloyd of East Lansing, Michigan, one of the acknowledged pioneers in American linguistic studies.

Appreciation must also be expressed to Mr. Edwin Barber, College Department Editor of Harper & Row, for his encouragement and support, which took the unusual form of distributing an early version of this paper to his travelling staff.

Especially am I grateful to Professors Louis A. Sheets of Trinity College, University of Toronto, and to Donald A. Sears, Cal-State College at Fullerton, who lent considerable and wise assistance in preparing the bibliography in Appendix B. To Professor Richard Daigle, University of Bridgeport, special thanks for updating the bibliography for the present edition.

L.M.

WHERE DO *YOU* STAND ON LINGUISTICS?

I

Preface

There have been three major stages in language study: (1) the 18th century *prescriptionist stage,* during which grammarians prescribed rules in an attempt to control and regulate the language; (2) the 19th century stage of philology or *historical linguistics,* during which scholars turned their attention to studying the origin of language, its changes through time, and the interrelations among various languages; (3) the 20th century stage of *descriptive linguistics,* which concentrates on analyzing language as it currently functions. Among the most active of the scholars representing this third stage have been the "Structuralists," so called because of the heavy emphasis they place on structure—i.e., on grammatical forms and syntactical patterns.

This new descriptive stage of language study dates roughly from Bloomfield's *Language* in 1933 and Fries' *American English Grammar* in 1940. Some of the more ardent descriptionists have sought to restrict the term "linguistics" to their own modern type of analysis. Such a restriction, however, seems hardly fair or accurate when we consider the dependence of descriptive study on historical background. In this paper, therefore, the term "linguistics" is used broadly to include both the historical and descriptive types of linguistic study.

The centers of linguistic study in this country are now at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, Cornell, California (Berkeley), and Michigan. Among the organizations currently promoting linguistic study are the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Linguistic Society of America, and the American Dialect Society. The Federal Project English has also become interested in linguistics, through the establishment (for example) of the Curriculum Development Center at the University of Nebraska. This Center is now seeking to construct an integrated curriculum in language, composition, and literature for kindergarten through college Freshman English.

The newcomer to linguistics is often irritated, frustrated, and alienated by what appears to be the esoteric jargon of professional linguists. Since such jargon is not too important for our purposes here, it is relegated to Appendix A. What *is* important, however, are the major linguistic principles and their practical implications for the English classroom. Such principles and implications can be expressed in relatively simple terms, and when so expressed should be examined critically by every person with any responsibility for teaching English on the high school or college level. At a time when *Webster's New International Dictionary, Third Edition* has made linguistics a subject of discussion for the general public, it ill behooves the English teacher to play the role of ostrich. Yet at a recent regional English conference, only one-fifth of the many high school teachers present had even heard of the term "linguistics." Under such circumstances it is perhaps worth noting that linguistics will not go away simply by ignoring it. If this relatively new field is eventually to be dismissed in whole or in part from a modern English curriculum, it should be dismissed on the basis of knowledge, not on the basis of superstition or ignorance.

You are therefore invited to take the "test" below. This is *not* a test of your knowledge of linguistics. Few but professional linguists could construct or pass such an examination. Rather this is a test of your *reaction* to various linguistic principles and implications. Aside from the unapologized-for fun of taking the test, three major purposes are implicit in its construction: (1) to clarify in layman's terms the major linguistic ideas; (2) to help the individual instructor to determine or clarify his own attitude toward linguistics and its applications to the classroom; (3) to stimulate constructive discussion among instructors and others on what is probably the most controversial development in the English field. As a specific stimulant to discussion, you are encouraged to make annotations opposite the various test items, and then to compare your annotations with those of your colleagues.

The test consists of 170 items: 106 statements of principle, and 64 practical implications. Obviously the test can lay no claim to exhaustiveness. The list of items could no doubt be extended almost infinitely. But most of the basic linguistic principles are surely included, and the test should therefore give each reader some rough idea of where he stands on the issue of linguistics.

II

Test Directions

You will note that each statement is preceded by the letters "A" and "D". Read each statement carefully, then circle the "A" if you agree or the "D" if you disagree. If you agree with the statement except for the addition, deletion, or modification of *one or two words*, then make such a *minor* change and circle the "A". If you are unable to make up your mind on any given item, then do not circle anything. Some of the statements might seem trite or insignificant, but they are in Chesterton's words "tremendous trifles" because behind them lurk important linguistic principles.

Probably no teacher who takes this test will agree (or disagree) with all the statements. In some instances, perhaps, those who consider themselves hostile to linguistics will discover that they agree with certain large segments of linguistic thinking. In other instances, those who have considered themselves very "pro-linguistics" might be startled to discover that when it comes to practical classroom implications, they are not so "pro" as they thought. In any event, each person who takes the test would do well to compare his "abstract principle" score with his "practical implications" score. To aid in such a comparison, all practical classroom implications have been asterisked and so labeled, except in the next-to-last part of the test, where the asterisk is sufficient designation. Although some practical implications have been grouped together in the next-to-last part, many classroom implications have been strategically scattered throughout other portions of the test, on the assumption that these implications will be better understood if they are allowed to appear within their theoretical contexts.

The reader should be cautioned that the test statements are *not* intended as a presentation of my own views. On the contrary, with some of the statements I would vigorously disagree. When a preliminary version of this test was distributed locally on a trial basis, the author was attacked on the one hand as a crusading propagandist for linguistics, and on the other as a sly tongue-in-cheek opponent who sought insidiously to undermine the linguistic position through a pretended objectivity. Although I am honored that some should think me capable of such brilliant Machiavellian tactics, the simple truth is that almost all of the test items are paraphrases from the writings of professional linguists. Many of the documents used for such paraphrasing are listed in Appendix B. However, the actual source of any given statement has deliberately been omitted, because the statement should obviously be judged on its own merit, not on the personality who made it.

Since linguists sometimes disagree with one another, there are no doubt some inconsistencies among the test statements. However, an effort has been made to avoid "lunatic fringe" positions, and to emphasize the positions of the large group of moderate linguists. It is hoped therefore that the test statements flow rather naturally from one to another, and that contradiction among the statements has been successfully reduced to a minimum.

You are asked not to look at the scoring key at the end of this test until after you have completed the 170 items. Such peeking constitutes cheating, and will disqualify you as a seeker of linguistic truth.

III

The Test

Language Change

Circle "A" (Agree) or "D" (Disagree) or Neither.

A D 1. Every living language changes gradually through the centuries.

A D 2. No amount of protest or condemnation can stop this change.

A D 3. Language change does not represent decay or corruption. A later stage of a language is neither better nor worse than an earlier stage.

A D 4. Language not only does change, but it must change if it is to accommodate changing times and conditions. Without change, language could not continue to communicate to the people of each new epoch. Hence change is a sign of health, rather than of corruption.

A D 5. Language is on the move not only historically but geographically. Thus linguistic geography shows us that the word "tonic" (for soda pop) began in Boston but has spread out from Boston to a radius of fifty miles.

A D *6. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The old prescriptive rules derived from 18th century grammars are inadequate for the classroom teaching of modern English to modern students, because such rules, being static and unchanging, do not and can not take account of the scientifically recorded fact that language changes.

A D 7. If we were to bring King Alfred, Chaucer, and Hemingway together, they would probably not understand one another.

A D 8. Five hundred years from now, listeners probably won't be able to understand our own mid-20th century English without special study.

A D 9. Gradual language changes occur in such areas as pronunciation, vocabulary, semantics (word-meaning), and usage. For example, Pope rimed "tea" with "way"; "penicillin" was not in the vocabulary of the Beowulf poet; "silly" in Chaucer meant "unfortunate"; and "like," though originally used as a preposition, emerged in the 16th century as a subordinating conjunction among some educated people.

A D 10. Words also change in social acceptability. "Ain't" was considered fashionable and elegant in the 18th century.

A D *11. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The student should be taught not that "ain't" is wrong, but simply that it has gone out of fashion among educated people in our own time.

A D 12. The historical tendency of irregular nouns and verbs in English is to become regularized. Thus "hove," the old past tense of "heave," has gradually given way to "heaved." Similarily, "clove" has given way to "cleaved."

A D 13. This historical tendency toward regularization can probably be explained by the process of "analogical replacement"—that is, the majority of English nouns and verbs are regular in that they end their plurals in -s or -es and their past tenses in -ed. Thus the child who is learning the language tends by analogy to assign the regular pattern even to irregular words.

A D 14. Because of this analogical replacement, it is not unlikely that in five hundred years the plural of "goose" will be "gooses," and the past tense of "drink" will be "drinked."

A D 15. The use of the dative "me" in "*Me* was given a book" was considered the correct form in Middle English. Such usage today would be considered infantile, illiterate, or (in an adult) a sign of mental incompetence.

A D *16. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: A Freshman English course should contain a unit on the history of the English language, so that the student might come to realize the many types of changes that have taken place in his mother tongue through the centuries.

Semantics

A D 17. In the course of a language's history, meaning shifts. For example, in Falstaff's time "wench" was a complimentary term for a girl. Also "bede" referred to prayer, then to the rosary used in prayer, finally to jewelry.

A D 18. Throughout the history of a language, meaning shifts faster than form or sound.

A D 19. The total meaning of a word consists of both its denotation and its connotation. "Father" and "my old man" both denote the male head of a family, but each expression has a different connotation.

A D 20. The connotation, or emotional association, of a given word might be different for each person, because each person's background and experiences differ from the next person's. Thus "coffee" might connote The Grill for a university student, but a coffee plantation for a land-owner from Brazil.

A D 21. Some words, like "mother" or "home," have generally favorable or pleasant connotations for most people, and can therefore be used to advantage in oratory, argument, and persuasion.

A D *22. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: In order to develop the freshman student's precision and accuracy in word choice, he should be taught the distinctions between denotation and connotation, and the relation of these to various categories of synonyms.

A D 23. A word means whatever a given generation or group of people make it mean. There is no meaning apart from actual usage.

A D 24. Meaning in any significant communicative sense (as distinguished from the dictionary meaning of isolated words) depends on structure or sentence pattern rather than vice versa. Thus the difference in meaning between "Joe ate the fish" and "The fish ate Joe" results not from the isolated words (which are identical in both sentences) but rather from the order or arrangement of the words.

Speech

A D 25. The stress we put on words—that is, the loudness or softness with which we pronounce them—often determines meaning. Note the verbal difference between "*light*house keeper" and "light *house*keeper." Note also how a stress on any one of the four words in "This is my brother" changes the connotation of that sentence.

A D 26. No word has one and only one correct pronunciation. There are many correct pronunciations of a given word, depending on the group in which one moves.

A D 27. In other words, the only arbiter of pronunciation is usage. Therefore any pronunciation is right if it corresponds with the pronunciation of those among whom one is living and working.

A D *28. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Classroom teachers should strive to demolish the attitude (common among students and the general public) that there is only one correct pronunciation for each word.

Relation of Speech to Writing

A D 29. Language is primarily speech, in the sense that: (a) speech emerged first historically, coming at least 500,000 years ago, whereas man has written for only a few thousand years; (b) speech is used more frequently in everyday intercourse; (c) writing is merely a symbolization of speech: you can have speech without writing—many peoples do—but not vice versa.

A D 30. Therefore language is most easily defined as a system of speech sounds through which humans communicate with one another.

A D *31. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Since speech or sound is the essence of human communication, a Freshman English (or high school English) course should contain some study of the physiology of sound—that is, how sounds result from the airstream passing through the lungs, throat, mouth, and nose.

A D 32. Language is not simply communication. It is also a means by which the individual seeks to order and control the world around him. Thus the baby labels the objects in his crib by talking at them; the student gets to understand an abstract principle by verbalizing it.

A D 33. Though speech may be called "primary" in certain historical, linguistic, and quantitative ways, it cannot be said to be more important than writing because: (a) writing is one of the chief distinctions between man and animals; (b) without writing we could not preserve the thoughts of wise men, compile reference works, record data—in short, achieve progress and civilization; (c) without writing the amount and types of literature would be seriously reduced.

A D *34. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Considering the admittedly vast importance of writing, a Freshman English (or high school English) course should contain a unit on the development of writing through such stages as pictorial, Babylonian cuneiform, and the alphabet.

A D *35. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Since speech and writing are so intimately related, a "Communications" course combining writing and speech makes more sense than does the traditional academic division between "Freshman Composition" and "Fundamentals of Speech."

A D *36. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The Freshman English course should contain training not only in speech and writing, but also in their corollaries listening and reading.

A D 37. Writing is completely arbitrary in that no letter (for example, "b") has any innate or necessary connection with the sound it represents. The sound /b/ could just as easily be represented by the letter x, y, or t.

A D 38. It makes no difference what letters (symbols) are used to represent sounds, provided the letters are used consistently.

A D 39. Traditional English spelling is a poor symbolization of speech, because the letters are not used consistently. For example, in English spelling a single letter can represent several different sounds, while a single sound is sometimes represented by different letters. Thus in English there is not the accurate one-to-one relation between sound and symbol that makes for a precise system of spelling.

A D 40. Conventional spelling, based on our 26-letter alphabet, is obviously inadequate when we consider that English has at least 33 major sounds—24 consonants and 9 vowels.

A D *41. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Teaching the major speech sounds will help the student better to understand the relation (or lack of relation) between sound and spelling, and will therefore help the student to improve his spelling.

A D 42. Conventional spelling does have the advantage of uniformity. Everybody spells (or is expected to spell) the same way.

A D 43. Moreover, too precipitous reform of spelling would cut us off from the literature of the past.

A D 44. Because of its inadequacies, conventional spelling will probably be reformed over the next 500 to 1000 years.

A D *45. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Meanwhile, instructors should *not* advise students to deviate from conventional spelling, because of the unfortunate social and economic rejection that would surely follow.

A D 46. Yet we must concede that many so-called "commonly misspelled words" are commonly misspelled because they violate common sense.

A D *47. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The professor should aim to help the student reach reasonable success in spelling—not impossible perfection. Given the inadequate spelling system with which we all must contend, the teacher should not inflict harsh penalties for student misspellings on themes.

A D *48. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Spelling drills on long lists of words are boring, time-consuming, and of doubtful value to the student. A better method for improving spelling is to encourage each student to compile, study, and master a personalized "black list" of words that he himself has misspelled on themes.

A D 49. Punctuation to some extent symbolizes intonation. For example, a moderate pause in speech is symbolized by a comma, and a complete break or falling into silence is symbolized by a period.

A D *50. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Teaching intonation (i.e., the stress, pitch, and junctures with which we utter sounds) will aid the student in discerning syntax or word-groupings and will therefore help the student to improve his punctuation.

A D 51. Punctuation is also to some extent (a) a matter of taste; (b) a matter of level of usage—that is, we use more or "closer" punctuation in formal writing than in informal; (c) a matter of convention as regularized by printers, editors, publishers, and printer's manuals.

A D *52. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Aside from the use of the period to mark the end of a sentence or the use of the comma to prevent misreading, stress on punctuation in the grading of student themes is not justified.

A D *53. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Classroom drills or exercises on punctuation are similarly unjustified.

A D 54. The use of capital letters symbolizes nothing in speech. "Helen" sounds the same whether we capitalize it or not.

A D 55. Capitalization began in the Middle Ages when the first letter of an illuminated manuscript was deliberately magnified and embroidered for decorative purposes. After wild variations in usage, capitalization gradually became standardized through the pressure of printers and editors.

A D 56. Thus capitalization is largely a matter of convention. There is no particular logic to it. It has been imposed on the language from outside, and is not an inherent element in the language.

A D *57 PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Aside from the use of the capital for obviously proper nouns (Cincinnati, Mary) and at the beginning of sentences, stress on capitalization in the grading of themes is not justified.

A D *58. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Classroom drills or exercises on capitalization are similarly unjustified.

A D *59. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: A composition course should concentrate on actual writing, not on drills, exercises, and workbooks which stress mechanical minutiae.

A D *60. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Further, the composition course should concentrate on the experience of writing as distinguished from the results of writing. Thus the grading of themes should be deemphasized by means of private conferences and public demonstrations with the opaque projector.

Usage

A D 61. Most of our traditional rules of grammar are derived from 17th and 18th century grammarians, who formulated prescriptions on how English should be written and spoken.

A D 62. These rules were sometimes based on personal tastes, whims, and eccentricities. For example, the 17th century John Wallis's complicated "will-shall" rules were concocted out of his own imagination.

A D 63. These "will-shall" rules have been virtually obliterated by (a) the difficulty of memorizing their complexity; and (b) the informal "I'll" contraction so often used in speech.

A D *64. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The student should not be compelled to follow the artificial will-shall rules, because such rules were never inherent in English and have little or no modern currency.

A D 65. In setting up their rules, the old-time grammarians frequently sought to make language follow the laws of logic.

A D 66. But logic cannot properly be applied to language. For example, "I didn't see nobody" might logically mean that the speaker did see somebody; but no listener would ever interpret the statement in that way.

A D 67. The "double negative" merely intensifies the negative and is certainly linguistically justifiable, though currently not socially acceptable in standard English.

A D 68. In Spanish and certain other languages, however, the double negative is considered the correct form.

A D 69. The old grammarian's rule that a sentence should never end with a preposition has no linguistic justification. The inherent structure of English, together with historical and current usage, all vindicate the occasional use of a preposition in the end position.

A D 70. In fact, avoidance of a preposition at the end of a sentence is sometimes impossible, or possible only with extreme awkwardness.

A D *71. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Students should not be penalized for ending sentences with prepositions, provided such usage produces natural and idiomatic English.

A D 72. Many of the 18th century prescriptionist rules were appropriated from Latin, and were a fairly good description of how Latin operates.

A D 73. For example, the rule against split infinitives was appropriated from Latin, where infinitives are not split because there is no "to" sign, as in "conferre" and "mittere."

A D 74. Actually, in English infinitives sometimes sound less awkward split than otherwise.

A D *75. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: A student should not be penalized for splitting infinitives unless such splitting produces obvious awkwardness or ambiguity.

A D 76. Prescriptive rules based on a dead and highly inflected language like Latin cannot fairly be applied to a living and relatively uninflected language like English.

A D 77. Scientific statistical studies reveal that many usages condemned by traditional rules are in good standing among educated people. Examples: "It's *me*." "Everyone should bring *their* book." "None of the girls *are* willing." "I'll try *and* go." "I feel *like* I'm going to faint."

A D 78. Hence traditional rules are unrealistic, in that they are increasingly at variance with what even educated people actually say and write.

A D *79. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The traditional or prescriptive approach therefore results in the teaching of an artificial "classroom English" which bears little relation to the English that even the teacher uses in the hall after the bell rings. Observing this, the student concludes that the study of English is a hoax. Thus he is alienated from what should be a fascinating adventure for him—the study of language as it really is.

A D 80. The traditional rule demands "With whom . . . ?" but almost everybody says "Who . . . with?"

A D 81. Such a "mistake," which almost everybody makes, is surely no longer a mistake.

A D *82. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The prescriptive approach is a psychologically ineffective teaching method because it emphasizes mistakes and errors. Since oftentimes these alleged mistakes are not really at variance with modern usage, such an approach begins by confusing the student and ends by frightening him into losing confidence in the use of his own language.

A D *83. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Even where the student makes genuine mistakes in acceptable usage or effective style, it is educationally disastrous to focus the student's attention on what you want him to abandon. Such error-oriented teaching results in more errors, not less—and explains at least in

part why college freshmen, after ten years of such teaching in high school, still make the same errors.

A D *84. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The prescriptive approach also tends to create animosity between teacher and student.

A D *85. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: To avoid this animosity, the teacher should encourage, not discourage. He should minimize negative criticism, and instead build on rather than condemn student usage. Filling a theme with red marks might satisfy the professor's ego, but such procedure has dubious educational value for the student.

A D *86. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: By way of building on rather than condemning student usage, the teacher should not conduct a crusade against student slang. Instead of alienating students by ridiculing or condemning their slang expressions, the teacher can build rapport by accepting and praising such slang as an exciting arena for studying change in meaning.

A D 87. A crusade against slang is really unnecessary because slang will go away by itself as the student grows up. Few fifty year old men say "23 Skiddoo!"

A D 88. The child who says "Can I go?" despite repeated admonitions to follow the "*may* for permission" rule is probably not stupid or deliberately disobedient. The child is simply following the usage of his peer group. The pressure to conform to his peer group is virtually irresistable, because the price of non-conformity is a rejection that most children would find intolerable.

A D 89. As just implied, the social forces operating on language are so vast and complex that against such forces the prescriptive rule is like a pea shooter against a tank. The grammarian who seeks to control language through externally imposed rules is stirring the ocean with a coffee spoon.

A D 90. In short, prescriptive rules have never been very effective in controlling the language.

A D *91. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: A Freshman English course should abandon the teaching of traditional rules in favor of a study of the way English actually operates when spoken and written by modern Americans.

A D 92. Scientific studies prove that there are "levels of usage"—that is, that the same person speaks or writes in a variety of ways according to the different situations in which he finds himself. Thus our language would be more formal for a United Nations speech than in a casual chat with close friends.

A D 93. The chief levels of usage can conveniently be designated as formal, informal, and vulgate or sub-standard. Informal corresponds roughly to "colloquial"—that is, to those words and expressions which are appropriate to everyday educated conversation and therefore to informal writing. Vulgate or sub-standard English is found chiefly among isolated dialectal groups, among people with little formal education, or in dialogue which seeks to recreate the speech of provincial or uneducated people.[1]

A D *94. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Students should be made aware of these levels of usage, especially of their own alternation between formal and informal English in various social situations.

A D 95. Because certain people speak "vulgate" or "sub-standard" English does not mean that we should sneer at the ditch-digger's or the uneducated farmer's language. On the contrary, we should view their language with sympathy and interest because: (a) it is effective for their level of living: (b) it often contains genuine poetic elements such as picturesque figures of speech; (c) it contains elements of historical authority—that is, it contains usages and forms which represent hold-overs from earlier language stages, such as "five mile (instead of miles) down the road."

A D *96. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Students, especially in a democracy, should be taught to appreciate the historical, poetic, and other significant elements in sub-standard speech.

A D 97. Linguists should be praised for their democratic spirit in: (a) attempting to heal class-wounds through sympathy for the speech practices of lower-income groups; (b) recognizing the right of the majority in any given speech (or writing) group to establish the standards of good English for that particular group.

A D 98. There is no kind or level of English which will sound good to everybody or bad to everybody under all conditions. Good English must therefore be judged in terms of (a) the speaker; (b) the subject; (c) the circumstances; (d) the audience.

A D 99. In other words, good or correct English is simply good usage, and good usage depends on acceptability and appropriateness. Thus a given usage is correct or good if it is honest in terms of the speaker's personality, effective in presenting the subject, appropriate to the situation, and linguistically acceptable to the audience for which it is intended.

---

[1] Some scholars follow Perrin in placing a "General" level of usage between formal and informal. However, by Perrin's own admission, "General English" includes that vast body of words and expressions common to both formal and informal usage. Hence the constructor of this test does not regard General English as a distinctive level of usage, though the reader is certainly free to so regard it.

A D 100. Accordingly, "them things" is correct if used in a shipyard to enlist the cooperation of low educational level shipworkers. It is incorrect if used in a letter to a corporation executive from whom one is seeking a job.

A D 101. In the first context above, "them things" is socially acceptable —i.e., acceptable to the uneducated group among whom one is working. In the second context, "them things" is socially unacceptable—i.e., unacceptable to the educated employer. In effect, then, no form or expression is ever wrong in itself, in isolation. It can only be *used* wrongly, that is, used inappropriately and hence unacceptably.

A D *102. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Accordingly, teachers should encourage the student to avoid "ain't" not because it is evil or irrational or wrong in itself, but because it provokes unfavorable reaction among those educated people with whom the student will presumably live and work, and on whom he will be dependent for social status and financial recognition.

A D *103. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The student can be far more powerfully motivated to improve his English by the socio-economic appeal just mentioned than by any appeal to traditional rules.

A D 104. In the last analysis, good English is whatever English is spoken by the group in which one moves most contentedly and at ease. To the Los Angeles bum, good English is the language of other Los Angeles bums. Correct speech is what sounds normal or natural to one's comrades. Incorrect speech is that which evokes in them discomfort or hostility or disdain.

A D 105. When we notice that on some streets the speed limit is 50 and on others 20 miles per hour, we do not accuse the Chief of Police of having no standards. Standards of correctness, like speed limits, vary in varying circumstances. There is no kind of English which is always correct (that is, appropriate) in every circumstance.

A D 106. The abandonment of absolute standards in determining good English does not mean the abandonment of all standards. But standards of good English must be flexible—that is, relative to time, place, and audience.

A D *107. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: In a linguistically oriented Freshman English course, the professor does not lose his authority. He simply becomes a different kind of authority. Whereas before he had been an authority on prescriptive rules, he now becomes an authority on levels of usage (as such usage is relayed to him through the scientifically accumulated data of professional linguists).

A D *108. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Similarly, in a linguistically oriented Freshman English course, the professor does not lose his status or function as a judge of good writing. But whereas he previously judged good writing on the basis of prescriptive rules, he now judges it on the basis of appropriate and acceptable modern usage.

Dictionaries

A D 109. The function of a dictionary is not to prescribe rules on how language should operate, but simply to record what people say and write.

A D 110. The above does not mean that the dictionary is any less an authority because it is descriptive. After all, the only authority lies in usage.

A D 111. Usage labels in a dictionary are of limited value, because the social status of words changes quickly, and the distinction between slang-colloquial and between colloquial-formal is vague anyhow.

A D 112. At least this can be said in favor of *Webster's New International Dictionary, Third Edition:* Its publication has brought the issue of linguistics into the open where it can be examined and debated freely.

A D 113. Webster's Third International is to be praised, because it fulfills the proper function of a dictionary as specified under item 109.

A D *114. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The student should be taught to prefer a dictionary which accurately reports usage, rather than a dictionary which seeks to lay down the law as to what should be said.

A D *115. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: One major unit of any Freshman English course should be a study of the historical development of dictionaries, an examination of the differences among important modern dictionaries, and an investigation of the current dictionary controversy.

Grammar

A D 116. The term "grammar" should be used to designate the inherent operational procedures—that is, the basic patterns and structure—of a language, rather than to designate a set of prescriptionist rules for controlling the language. In other words, grammar is properly descriptive, not prescriptive.

A D *117. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Only in the foregoing sense should grammar be taught in the classroom.

A D 118. English follows certain inherent laws (as distinguished from externally imposed rules) which if violated result in unintelligible English. For example, in English, a noun must follow a transitive verb if we are to avoid such gibberish as "I caught several large *foolish*." Again, in English word-group modifiers follow the words they modify, as "the cat *in the chair*." We would therefore violate an inherent operating principle of the language, and border on gibberish, if we said "the *in the chair* cat" or "the *where he lived* community."

A D *119. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: If (as in the above examples) a student were to violate an inherent law of the language, the teacher would be justified in marking such a statement "'wrong." Such violations, of course, are more likely to occur in the case of foreign students learning English, than in the case of native-born British or Americans.

A D 120. An acceptable definition of grammar might be as follows: Grammar is a description of those devices by which English signals the interrelations among the words which comprise a sentence. These devices are: (a) function words like prepositions and conjunctions; (b) inflections—that is, changes in grammatical form to indicate some change of meaning, as in the change from *run* to *ran* or from *boy* to *boys*. (c) word order.

A D 121. The only major inflections left from Anglo-Saxon are the noun plural, the many forms of pronouns, and the past tense for verbs. All other inflections, such as the subjunctive, are dying.

A D *122. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The student should not be penalized for failure to use the subjunctive, except in such standardized expressions as motions or recommendations ("I move that he *be* admitted") and with the first person pronoun (" If I *were* you . . .")

A D 123. Word order has become such a strong feature in Modern English that the pre-verb position is now established as "subject territory," and the post-verb as "object territory."

A D 124. The above point explains why most Americans are unconsciously pressured toward saying "*Who* are you going with" and "It is *me*."

A D 125. The traditional division of words into "parts of speech" is unsatisfactory because these divisions were set up 2000 years ago on the basis of ancient Greek, not on the basis of modern English or any other Germanic language.

A D 126. Another legitimate objection to conventional "parts of speech" is that they are inconsistently defined: that is, some are defined in terms of meaning, others in terms of function. Thus a noun is defined as "the name of a person, place, or thing," while a preposition is defined as a word that shows the relation of a noun to some other word.

A D 127. A more consistent (and therefore better) way to classify words would be on the basis of form—that is, on the basis of their inflections—and on the basis of their positions in standard sentence patterns. Thus a noun almost always ends in -s or -es in the plural, takes certain suffixes, and usually appears before the verb as subject or after the verb as object or predicate noun.

A D *128. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The student should be taught to classify words on some consistent basis such as that described in the preceding point.

A D 129. The classification of a word as noun, verb, adjective, or whatever, depends ultimately on the position of the word in the sentence pattern. No word in isolation is any part of speech (or "form class"). A word can be classified only within the context of some sentence. Thus "Monday" is a noun in "*Monday* was a rainy day" but an adverb in "She arrived *Monday*."

A D 130. There are several traditional definitions of a sentence, such as (a) a sentence is a complete thought; (b) a sentence is a group of words containing a main subject and a main verb or predicate. None of the traditional definitions of a sentence is satisfactory because there are some sentences which are not complete thoughts or which do not contain even main subjects and verbs.

A D 131. Some of the more frequent sentence patterns in English might be described as follows:

a.) Noun-Verb — Lions eat.
b.) Noun-Verb-Predicate Adjective — Lions are fierce.
c.) Noun-Verb-Predicate Noun — That lion is Samson.
d.) Noun-Verb-Direct Object — Lions eat meat.
e.) Noun-Verb-Indirect Object-Direct Object — The lion gave me a mauling.

A D 132. The child who comes to school at the age of six can already speak English better than he will ever learn to speak another language. He already knows instinctively almost all he will ever know about grammar (as distinguished from style and vocabulary). If the child did not already automatically sort out words into parts of speech (or form classes) and if he did not already instinctively arrange words into patterns such as those described above, he would be unable to communicate.

A D *133. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: One purpose of a composition course is therefore (preferably in high school) to get the student to recognize in writing the patterns that he instinctively uses in speech.

A D *134. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: To this end, the most useful classroom exercise is to teach the student the basic sentence patterns, then to train him to expand these simple patterns through the addition of words, phrases, and clauses. Such a teaching method moves in a logical manner from the simple to the complex.

A D *135. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The classroom teaching of sentence patterns will help the student write better sentences. In other words, there is a definite correlation between conscious knowledge of such patterns and skill in composition.

A D *136. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The diagramming technique should *not* be used in the classroom, because it unwisely and illogically requires the student to break down a complicated sentence before he understands a simple one.

A D *137. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Classroom exercises on sentence patterns should evolve as quickly as possible into actual writing. Student themes should become longer and more complicated as the student masters increasingly complex types of sentences, and as the teacher supplements a study of sentence patterns with a study of style and organization.

A D 138. Grammatical analysis can be enhanced if it uses examples drawn from literary texts—e.g., Virginia Woolf's use of the present participle in *The Waves*.

A D *139. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Literature can to some extent be integrated with classroom grammatical analysis in that the structure of language can be taught through literary examples.

General Relation of Linguistics to the Classroom Teaching of English

A D 140. The domain of linguistics ends with the period at the end of the sentence. Linguistics is concerned with words, phrases, clauses, and the ways in which these are grammatically combined to produce meaningful utterances.

A D 141. Linguistics is *not* concerned with *rhetoric*—that is, not concerned with such matters as sentence variety; precision, clarity, and logic of expression; paragraph development and transition; general organization, including effective openings and closings; picturesque language; word-choice; imaginativeness, originality of approach, style.

A D 142. A radical improvement is needed in the way English is taught in high schools and colleges.

A D *143. By way of achieving that improvement, high schools (in conjunction with elementary schools) should teach linguistics as defined above. That is, teach a consistent scheme of word-classes and the basic sentence patterns, plus giving the student extended practice in recognizing and writing sophisticated versions of the basic sentence patterns. In this way rhetoric would become the special province of the college freshman course, thus avoiding wasteful duplication of student-teacher effort and time.

A D *144. Until such time as the high school curriculum is modernized, however, both linguistics and rhetoric will need to be taught in college. This means that the Freshman English course should use a linguistic text and a rhetoric in conjunction with one another. Certainly a linguistic text alone is not sufficient to meet the obligations of a college Freshman English course.

A D. 145. It is the domain of rhetoric, as defined in #141, that should be the chief concern of the college Freshman English instructor and of the student who writes college themes.

A D *146. In teaching a linguistically oriented Freshman English course, the teacher must be careful to remember that what is linguistically justified might not always be stylistically effective. For example, it is linguistically justifiable to end a sentence with a preposition. Since, however, the end of a sentence is the strongest possible rhetorical position, that position should ordinarily be reserved for some more important word.

A D 147. The job of the linguist is essentially to supply the high school and college teacher with accurate scientific data on language change and on what modern people actually say and write.

A D 148. The linguist, like any other scientist or scholar, neither approves of nor disapproves of his findings. To say that the linguist approves of "them things" because he records the use of such an expression among some segments of the population, is as silly as arguing that the historian approves of war because he records the Battle of Waterloo.

A D 149. Thus the linguist does not say to the teacher, "Whatever is, is right." Instead the linguist merely says, "Whatever is, *is*."

A D *150. The teacher cannot morally ignore the findings of linguists, especially the findings that language is in constant flux and that modern educated usage differs much from prescriptionist rules. As a matter of academic honesty, the teacher cannot pretend that this data does not exist.

A D *151. It follows that the teacher is obligated to use a standard of correctness or good English more consistent with the facts of language as those facts have been revealed in linguistic studies.

A D *152. The role of the classroom teacher (as distinguished from the scientist-linguist) is therefore to make value-judgments of student writing on the basis of (a) realistic standards of good English—i.e., standards geared to currently acceptable and appropriate usage; (b) principles of rhetoric derived from the teacher's own knowledge of writing, literary criticism, and literature.

A D *153. It is quite proper for a teacher to lower a theme grade because of such student deficiencies as (a) violation of an inherent law or operating principle of the language—e.g., "I caught several large foolish"; (b) inappropriate and therefore unacceptable usage for the situation and audience involved—e.g., "ain't" in an MLA paper; (c) illogical, imprecise, awkward, or incoherent expression; (d) inept style resulting from enfeebling repetition, weak paragraph transition, or the like.

A D *154. However, in grading themes, it is better to think (and to get the student to think) in terms of acceptable and unacceptable usage rather than in terms of right and wrong. Similarly, it is better to encourage the student to think in terms of more effective or less effective style rather than in terms of absolute good or bad.

A D *155. In summary, a Freshman English course should not consist of the following: (a) the teaching and memorizing of traditional rules derived from 18th century prescriptionist grammars; (b) drills on spelling, punctuation, and capitalization; (c) workbooks or exercises of the fill-in or objective variety.

A D *156. Instead, a Freshman English course should contain: (a) exercises on basic sentence patterns (unless this has already been covered in high school): (b) constant writing of an increasingly complex nature; (c) a grading system which avoids multitudinous symbols and concentrates on rhetoric—i.e., on organization and style: (d) an introduction to the nature of one's own language, from both a historical and descriptive standpoint.

Some Concluding Observations on Language

A D 157. There is no such thing as a primitive language. Every language, such as Eskimo or Hindustani, is complex and worthy of respect.

A D 158. Language and literature are separate entities. A language like English or French which has a literature attached is not better as a language than one which lacks a literature. The admitted beauty and merit of English literature should not properly accrue to the merit of the English language.

A D 159. Ideas are less important than an author's technique. The fallacy in literary criticism lies in its preoccupation with the author's ideas, rather than with his handling of language.

A D *160. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The classroom study of literature should focus primarily on technique rather than content.

A D *161. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Some aspects of linguistics can be of aid in analyzing literary technique. For example, principles of phonology can be used to analyze poetic sound devices.

A D 162. An individual's theology or philosophy of life is controlled not so much by his school, home, or church as by the language he speaks.

A D 163. A better understanding of one language (say English) can be gained by sometimes comparing its usage and structure with those of other languages.

A D 164. Because of their interest in all languages (regional and national) and in the concept of "one language for one world", linguists can properly be described as commendably cosmopolitan or international in their approach.

A D 165. Even within the same national language, various geographical regions usually have their own dialects—that is, their own variations of pronunciation, grammatical forms, syntactical combinations, and vocabulary.

A D 166. In fact, to some extent every individual represents a dialect unto himself. Every person has certain unique features in his speech and writing.

A D *167. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Within reason, the teacher should encourage the student to develop his own colorful dialect—his own individual style.

A D 168. Language is a pattern of practices which the child learns not by precept but by imitation of what his elders actually say. Every child automatically has an easy command of his home town speech.

A D *169. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: The elementary or high school student does not need to be taught his home town speech (of which he is already a master), though the student will probably need to be taught the difference between his home town dialect and a national standard English.

A D *170. PRACTICAL IMPLICATION: Considering the immense importance of language in human and international relations, the readings in a Freshman English course (for the first term at least) should be largely confined to articles on *language*, rather than to literature or to essays treating modern socio-political and similar problems.

IV

Scoring The Test

To determine your test score, give yourself *one point* for each circled "A," *minus one-half point* for each circled "D," and *zero points* for any item where you circled *neither* "A" *nor* "D."

A suggested key for interpreting your score is as follows:

Total Score	*Probable Attitude toward Linguistics*
170-137	enthusiastic
136-103	sympathetic
102- 69	on the fence
68- 35	skeptical
34- 0	hostile

Total Score on Abstract Principles Only	*Probable Attitude toward Linguistic Theory*
106-71	approve
70-36	neutral
35- 0	disapprove

Total Score on Practical Implications Only	*Probable Attitude toward Linguistic Practice in Classroom*
64-43	approve
42-22	neutral
21- 0	disapprove

V

Some Pre-publication Reactions

In March, 1963, a mimeographed version of this test was distributed to members of the University of Cincinnati English Department. Since the UC group is no doubt similar in personnel to many large English departments, its reaction might be of interest to similar groups elsewhere.

Of a total departmental membership of 58, some 28 submitted scores (anonymously, as requested). Among the items which drew frequent disagreement were Nos. 14, 23, 31, 34, 84, 97b, 130, 159, 160, and 162. Strongest reaction came with numbers 35 and 60, which precipitated emotional counterattack. The highest score was 167 ("enthusiastic"), the lowest 53 ("skeptical"). No member placed in the "hostile" category for the total score, nor did anyone place in the "disapprove" category on abstract principles only. However, three members placed in the "disapprove" category on practical implications. In a number of instances, the practical implications score was proportionately lower than the other two scores. One member wrote frankly that he was "an abstract hero but a practical coward." The breakdown of total scores (15 enthusiastic, 7 sympathetic, 4 on the fence, 2 skeptical) suggests that at least among University of Cincinnati English professors there is a wide spread of attitude toward linguistics, ranging from adulation to doubt and even to hostility in the case of practical classroom applications. In this connection, we must remember that approximately half (30) of the department members did not submit scores. It is probably not unfair to speculate that some of these were either hostile toward linguistics, or fearful of the whole issue, or else not sufficiently interested in linguistics to take the test.

In any event, some of those who did submit scores have reported that they now know more clearly than before just where they stand on the linguistic issue. If the test can be equally helpful to others, the author will regard it as having served its purpose.

APPENDIX A:

SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF SOME LINGUISTIC TERMS

Linguistics is the *scientific* study of language—i.e., the study of language as it is, rather than an attempt to formulate ideals of what language should be or might be. Linguistics notes how language functions, not how it should function. There are two main types of linguistics: historical and descriptive. *Historical linguistics* examines the origin, change, and interrelations among languages. *Descriptive linguistics* examines the sounds, usages, writing practices, grammatical forms, and patterns of language as it currently operates. Though descriptive linguistics has developed more recently, both types are interrelated and depend on one another. Also, both types of linguistics are concerned in some degree with the following facets of language study:

A. PHONOLOGY—*i.e., Speech Sounds.*

Phonology can be divided into "phonetics" and "phonemics." *Phonetics* is the transcription (in brackets) of all detectable variations in sound, even those variations which have no significance in determining meaning. *Phonemics* is the transcription (using slanted lines) only of "significant" speech-sounds—i.e., only of those sounds which are used to distinguish meaning among words.

Actually, a *phoneme* is a bundle of similar sounds heard by the speaker as one sound. Thus the initial sounds of "key," "cough," and "cup" [k] [k̟] [q] are slightly different because of their vowel "environments," but these slight differences would be apparent only to a highly trained ear. Such slight differences are not used in English to distinguish meanings. Hence we say that the sounds [k] [k̟] [q] are all *allophones* (that is, slight variations) of the phoneme /k/. In other words, allophones are the variations within a phoneme.

B. INTONATION—*i.e., The Way We Utter Speech Sounds.*

There are three types of intonation: (1) *stress* (or accent)—how loud or soft we speak the word; (2) *pitch*—whether we speak in soprano or bass; (3) *juncture*—a pause or break in speaking. More precisely, the term "juncture" refers to pitch change with an accompanying retardation of sound just before the pause or break.

The pause-type of juncture is closely related to the comma-punctuation, and the break-type of juncture is closely related to the period.

Intonation, especially stress, often clarifies syntax and distinguishes among various possible meanings. Thus in the sentence "He is my brother," there are four possible meanings, depending on whether one wishes to emphasize *he, is, my,* or *brother*. Another example of stress controlling meaning is the word "since." In the expression "since 1800," we mean "beginning with 1800" if we stress *1800*, or "after 1800" if we stress *since*.

C. MORPHOLOGY—*i.e., The Grammatical Forms of Words (especially inflectional changes).*

A *morpheme* is a "significant" unit of form—i.e., a word or part of a word which conveys meaning. Thus morphology and phonology are closely related to *semantics*, the study of meaning.

Morphology distinguishes between "free" and "bound" forms. *Free forms* (e.g., boy) can convey meaning when standing alone. *Bound forms* (e.g., the "-s" in boys) can convey meaning only when bound to some other form. Examples of morphemes, both bound and free, are noun plural suffixes, verb past tense suffixes, and thousands of individual words.

Morphology treats individual words or parts thereof, whereas syntax treats word-groups.

D. SYNTAX—*i.e., Sentence Patterns.*

Syntax treats the grouping of words into phrases, clauses, and sentences, so as to form meaningful patterns. Syntax concentrates on word-order and on such relational words as prepositions and conjunctions, which signal relationship among various words.

From the linguistic point of view *morphology* and *syntax*, taken in conjunction, constitute *grammar.*

E. SEMANTICS—*i.e., Word Meaning.*

Semantics is the study of meaning and of changes in meaning throughout the historical development of a language. In this sense, semantics is *not* to be confused with the highly specialized field of General Semantics, which explores the psychological and sociological implications of the "talk situation."

APPENDIX B

LINGUISTICS: A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Revised by RICHARD J. DAIGLE, *University of Bridgeport*

The items below are presented in two categories: (1) books and articles of a popularized yet reliable nature, suitable for those who have not previously read in the area of linguistics and who would like to obtain as painless an introduction as possible; (2) books in the intermediate range, for those who already have some acquaintance with linguistics but who probably have no intention of specializing in the field. Works of a more technical nature are not included in this bibliography because readers ready for such material are better served by more complete listings. Perhaps the best bibliography for anyone just investigating the field is: Harold B. Allen, *Linguistics and English Linguistics* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), a Goldentree Bibliography, $1.65. Readers who wish to get some idea of the staggering number and variety of linguistics articles should consult the "General Language and Linguistics" and the "English Linguistics" sections of the annual bibliography published every June in PMLA.

Any attempt to arrange titles in an approximate order of difficulty naturally runs the danger of making tenuous and sometimes even arbitrary distinctions. However, it is hoped that such an arrangement will give the uncertain newcomer some idea of where he can start investigating the field, as well as some notion of the vast area of possible exploration should he become sufficiently interested. Certainly the person who began at the beginning of this bibliography and proceeded title by title to the end would complete something akin to a Great Books course in linguistics.

In addition to the three major categories, attention is called to the preliminary section on "Traditional Approaches." Any fairminded reader will wish to consider both sides of the linguistic argument before making up his mind, and should therefore read at least two of the items in this category.

I TRADITIONAL APPROACHES

Bodmer, Frederick, and Lancelot Hogben. *The Loom of Language.* New York: Norton, 1944.

Foley, Louis. "Upsetting the Alphabet-Cart," *Word Study,* XXXV (April, 1960), 1-5.

Follett, Wilson. "Bargain Basement English," *Atlantic,* CCV (February, 1960), 73-76.

Pei, Mario. "The Dictionary as a Battlefront," *Saturday Review* (July 21, 1962), pp. 44-46, 55-56. (See also Bonney's "An English Teacher Answers Mario Pei," listed in Section II.)

———. *The Story of Language.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1949. Mentor MT 296, $0.75. (Severely attacked by Hall in bibliography of *Linguistics and Your Language.)*

———. *The Story of English.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1962. Premier D 167, $0.50.

Sledd, James, and Wilma Ebbitt. *Dictionaries and That Dictionary.* Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1962. Paper, $2.75. (Though Sledd is a linguist and has the last word here, the book contains a number of non- and anti-linguistic articles.)

Strunk, William, and E. B. White. *The Elements of Style.* New York: Macmillan, 1959. MP 107, $0.95. (One of the most eloquent and frequently used prescriptive grammars.)

II LINGUISTICS FOR THE BEGINNER

A. *Introductions and Explanations of Linguistics as a Field of Study* (the first three items are listed in suggested order of reading)

Sears, Donald A. *The Discipline of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. (Designed for English majors, this book devotes one chapter to explaining the role of linguistics within the total academic discipline of "English." Extensive Bibliography, pp. 15-19.)

Hall, Robert. *Linguistics and Your Language.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1960. Anchor 201, $1.45. (Revised ed. of *Leave Your Language Alone.* An entertaining though sometimes irritating defense of linguistics. Annotated bibliography.)

Hughes, John P. *The Science of Language. An Introduction to Linguistics.* New York: Random House, 1962. (To calm you down after Hall!)

Doster, William C. *First Perspectives on Language.* New York: American Book Co., 1963. (An anthology for college freshmen.)

Friend, Joseph H. *An Introduction to English Linguistics.* Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1967. Paper. (Aimed at the beginner, including the high-school student.)

B. *Historical*

Baugh, Albert C. *A History of the English Language.* 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Bradley, Henry. *The Making of English.* 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1951. St Martin's, $1.50. (A classic by one of the editors of the OED.)

Bryant, Margaret M. *Modern English and Its Heritage.* 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Jespersen, Otto. *Growth and Structure of the English Language.* New York: Doubleday, 1960. Anchor 46, $0.95.

Laird, Charlton. *The Miracle of Language.* Chicago: World Publishing Co., 1953. Premier D-51, $0.50. (Highly readable and factually sound.)

Marckwardt, Albert H. *Introduction to the English Language.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

————. *American English.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. Oxford paper, $1.95.

Matthews, M. M. *The Beginnings of American English.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931. Phoenix 123, $1.50.

Myers, L. M. *The Roots of Modern English.* Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1966. (To acquaint the reader with fundamentals before he goes on to more detailed treatments of the subject.)

Smith, Logan Pearsall. *The English Language.* 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966. Opus 7. (Brief and readable.)

Whitehall, Harold. "The English Language," *The New World Dictionary* (1953), pp. xv-xxxiv. (A readily available, concise history of the language.)

C. *Descriptive*

Allen, Harold B., ed. *Readings in Applied English Linguistics.* 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964. Paper, $4.50. (Includes articles on the history of linguistics, linguistics today, linguistic geography, usage, teaching grammar and composition, dictionary, literature.)

————. "Applied Linguistics and the Teaching of English in the United States," *Linguistic Reporter,* IV (1962), 2-4.

Bonney, Margaret K. "An English Teacher Answers Mario Pei," *Saturday Review* (September 15, 1962), pp. 58-60, 75. (See Pei's article "The Dictionary as a Battlefront" under I—Traditional Approaches.)

Christensen, Francis. "Between Two Worlds." Presidential Address for 1962 English Conference of California. *Word Study*, XXXVIII (October, 1962), 1-8.

College English, XXVI, 4 (January, 1965). Linguistics Issue.

Fairclough, G. Thomas. "The Modern English Grammar Course at the University of Nebraska," *Nebraska Curriculum Development Center Bulletin* (Vol. I, no. 4), pp. 8-10.

Francis, W. Nelson. *The English Language: An Introduction*. New York: Norton, 1963. (A very readable and enjoyable introduction to the language, aimed at college freshmen.)

Fries, Charles C. "American English Grammar," from *Thorndike-Barnhart Comprehensive Dictionary*, 1955.

Hayakawa, S. I. "Linguistics and the Teacher of Composition," *ETC.*, VII (1949-50), 97-103. A similar article by Hayakawa, "Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English," may be found in *Baltimore Bulletin of Education*, XXIX (January, 1952), 9-22.

Horne, David. "I'd Rather Be Right Than Webster," *Scholarly Books in America*, Dec. 1962, pp. 4-6. (Despite the title, this is a prolinguistic piece by the editor of Yale University Press.)

Jespersen, Otto. *Essentials of English Grammar*. University: University of Alabama Press, 1964. (Reprint of a classic.)

_____. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. New York: Norton, 1965. Paper, N-307, $1.95.

Laird, Charlton. *Thinking about Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1959.

Lees, Robert B. "The Promise of Transformational Grammar," *English Journal*, LII (1963), 327-330.

Lefevre, Carl A. *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Lloyd, Donald. *Reading American English Sound Patterns*. Row Peterson Monograph 104. (Available free from Harper & Row, Evanston, Illinois.)

_____. "A 'Linguistic' Approach to English Composition," *Language Learning*, III (July-December, 1950), 109-116 ff.

_____. "Let's Get Rid of Miss Driscoll," *Educational Forum* (March, 1954), pp. 341-348.

_____. "The Implications of Linguistics for the Teaching of English." Paper presented to Middle Atlantic College English Association, May, 1963.

Long, Ralph B. *The Sentence and Its Parts: A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. (For teachers of English.)

Marckwardt, Albert H., and Fred Walcott. *Facts about Current English Usage*. (A Publication of the National Council of Teachers of English.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1938. (Old, but still an eye-opener for those concerned with "correctness.")

Payne, Robert. "Uses and Abuses of Linguistic Study." Address to English Club of Greater Cincinnati, April 21, 1960.

Pike, Kenneth L. "A Linguistic Contribution to Composition," *CCC* (NCTE), XV (1964), 82-88.

Potter, Simeon. *Our [British] Language*. London: Penguin, 1960. Pelican A-227, $0.95. (Annotated bibliography. This book and *Modern Linguistics*—see III-C—represent current European views.)

_____. *Language in the Modern World*. Baltimore: Penguin, 1960. Pelican A-470, $0.95.

Reed, Carroll E. *Dialects of American English*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1967.

Roberts, Paul. *Understanding Grammar*. New York: Harper & Row, 1954. (Combines the old and the new but avoids prescriptivism.)

_____. *Patterns of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956. (One of the first linguistic texts designed for high school. Highly readable.)

———. *Understanding English.* New York: Harper & Row, 1958. (One of the first linguistic texts aimed at college freshmen, this book is readable, enjoyable, enlightening.)
———. *English Sentences.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962.
———. "Linguistics and the Teaching of Composition," *English Journal,* LII (1963), 331-335.
Schlauch, Margaret. *The Gift of Language.* New York: Dover Publications, 1955. (Previously published in 1942 as *The Gift of Tongues,* this remains—though dated—a fascinating introduction.)
Tyler, Priscilla. "An English Teacher Looks at Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary," *Word Study,* XXXVIII (April, 1963), 1-8.

III INTERMEDIATE WRITINGS ON LINGUISTICS

A. *Introductions to and Explanations of Linguistics as a Field of Study*

Bloomfield, Morton W., and Leonard D. Newmark. *A Linguistic Introduction to the History of English.* New York: Knopf, 1963. (Uses different linguistic methods to describe various stages of the development of English.)
Dinneen, Francis P., S. J. *An Introduction to General Linguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967. (Presented historically, linguistic theories and contributions are reviewed.)
Gleason, H. A., Jr. *Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics.* 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961. (Detailed annotated bibliography.)
Hill, Archibald. *Introduction to Linguistic Structures: From Sound to Sentence in English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958.

B. *Historical*

Gray, Louis H. *Foundations of Language.* New York: Macmillan, 1939.
Hoijer, Harry, ed. *Language History.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965. (Chapters 17-27 of Bloomfield's *Language.* Only the notes and bibliography have been revised.)
Jespersen, Otto. *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin.* London: Allen & Unwin, 1922. Norton N-229, $2.45.
Kökeritz, Helge. *Shakespeare's Pronunciation.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
———. *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1962.
Krapp, George P. *The English Language in America.* 2 vols. New York: Century, 1925. (Bibliography indispensable for early works on English language in America.)
Lehmann, Winfred. *Historical Linguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1962. (Annotated bibliography.)
Leonard, Sterling. *The Doctrine of Correctness in English Usage, 1700-1800.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1929. (This was among the first to attack the concept of absolute correctness and to establish the idea "of levels of usage.")
Mencken, H. L. *The American Language.* 3 vols. New York: Knopf, 1936-48. (A one volume abridgment was edited by Raven McDavid, Jr., and published by Knopf in 1963.)
Nist, John. *A Structural History of English.* New York: St Martin's, 1966.
Partridge, Eric, and John W. Clark. *British and American English since 1900.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.
Pyles, Thomas. *The Origins and Development of the English Language.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
Schlauch, Margaret. *The English Language in Modern Times (since 1400).* Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959. (Distributed outside Poland by the Oxford University Press.)
Spitzer, Leo. *Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics.* Princeton: University Press, 1948.

Waterman, John T. *Perspectives in Linguistics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963. Phoenix 106, $1.95. (A very brief history of linguistics.)
Wyld, Henry Cecil. *History of Modern Colloquial English.* 3rd ed. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1953.

C. *Descriptive*

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1933. (A pioneering work in descriptive linguistics, but contains historical analysis also. See Hoijer in section III-B.)
Buchanan, Cynthia D. *A Programmed Introduction to Linguistics: Phonetics and Phonemics.* Boston: D. C. Heath, 1963.
Carroll, John B. *The Study of Language.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953. (Chapters on relation of linguistics to psychology, social sciences, philosophy, education, theory of communication.)
Caton, Charles E. *Philosophy and Ordinary Language.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963. Paper, $1.95.
Chatman, Seymour, and Samuel R. Levin, eds. *Essays on the Language of Literature.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967. (Some linguistic contributions to literary criticism.)
Conlin, David A. *Grammar for Written English.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961. Paper, $2.50.
Estrich, Robert M., and Hans Sperber. *Three Keys to Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1952.
Francis, W. Nelson. *The Structure of American English.* New York: Ronald, 1958. (Chapter 9, by Raven McDavid, is on "The Dialects of American English." Chapter 10 is on "Linguistics and the Teaching of English.")
Fries, Charles C. *American English Grammar.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940. (Description of actual modern usage based on analysis of thousands of letters in War Department's files.)
———. *The Structure of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1952. (Description of modern usage based on many hours of recorded telephone conversations.)
———. *Linguistics and Reading.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.
Gleason, H. A., Jr. *Linguistics and English Grammar.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
Hathaway, Baxter. *A Transformational Syntax: The Grammar of Modern American English.* New York: Ronald, 1967.
Hexagon, Vol. 1. (Summer, 1962). Published by Chicago Teachers College North. Issue devoted to articles on linguistics: "Pure and Applied Linguistics"; "Interrelationships of English and Foreign Languages"; "The Language Element in Literature"; "Spelling Design and Sounds"; "A First Semester College Course in English Language."
Hockett, Charles F. *A Course in Modern Linguistics.* New York: Macmillan, 1958. (Unusually clear exposition of linguistic theory.)
Joos, Martin. *The English Verb: Form and Meanings.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964. (Analyzes the verb in British English, based on *The Trial of Dr. Adams* by Sybille Bedford.)
Language and Learning, a special issue of the *Harvard Educational Review,* XXXIV, 2 (Spring, 1964).
Lloyd, Donald, and Harry Warfel. *American English in Its Cultural Setting.* New York: Knopf, 1956.
Potter, Simeon. *Modern Linguistics.* Fairlawn, N.J.: Oxford University Press, 1957. Norton, N-223, $1.25.
Sapir, Edward. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1923. Harvest 7, $1.25.
Sledd, James. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar.* Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1959.
Smith, Henry Lee. *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Stockwell, Robert P. "Transformational Grammar in Perspective," *English Studies Today*, 3rd series. Edinburgh: University Press, 1964.
Strang, Barbara M. H. *Modern English Structure*. New York: St Martin's, 1963. (A descriptive study of English not entirely divorced from traditional grammar.)
Thomas, Owen. *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965. (Very valuable for those frightened by transformational grammar.)
Trager, George L., and Henry Lee Smith. *An Outline of English Structure*. Norman, Oklahoma: Battenberg Press, 1951. (A later edition is Washington, D. C.: ACLS, 1956. A number of modern linguists have acknowledged indebtedness to this pioneering work.)
Whitehall, Harold. *The Structural Essentials of English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956.

IV ADVANCED LINGUISTIC WORKS

A. *Introduction to Linguistics as a Field of Study*

Joos, Martin, ed. *Readings in Linguistics: The Development of Descriptive Linguistics in America since 1925*. 3rd ed. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1963.

B. *Historical*

Hoenigswald, Henry M. *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960. Phoenix 178, $1.50.
Pedersen, Holger. *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic Science in the 19th Century*. Tr. John Webster Spargo. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1960. Midland 40, $2.95.

C. *Descriptive*

Carroll, John B., ed. *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. New York: Wiley, 1956. MIT 5, $1.95.
Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. New York: Humanities, 1957.
————. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1965.
Gelb, Ignace. *A Study of Writing*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952. Phoenix 109, $2.95.
Harris, Zellig. *Structural Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957. Phoenix 52, $2.25. (A highly technical treatise on symbolical linguistics, in which grammatical relationships are reduced to mathematical formulae.)
Hill, Archibald, ed. *Studies in American English: First, Second, and Third Conferences on Problems of Linguistic Analysis in English*. (Austin, April 1956, 1957, May 1958), 3 vols. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962. (Edited transcript of work papers and discussion; a sophisticated working over of various positions on phonemics, intonation, and syntax.)
Lees, Robert B. *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*. Rev. ed. Bloomington: Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, Publication No. 12 (Indiana Univ., 1963).
Marouzeau, Jules. *Lexique de la Terminologie Linguistique Francais, Allemand, Anglais, Italien*. 3e ed. Paris: Geuthner, 1951.
Pike, Kenneth L. *The Intonation of American English*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.
————. *Phonemics: A Technique for Reducing Languages to Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1947.
Whatmough, Joshua. *Language: A Modern Synthesis*. New York: St Martin's, 1956. Mentor MD 209, $0.50.
Whorf, Benjamin Lee. *Four Articles on Metalinguistics*. Washington, D. C.: Foreign Service Institute, 1949. (Though old, these articles point toward areas of linguistics still only partially explored.)